

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 28 are pending, with Claims 1, 16, 27, and 28 being independent.

Claims 1 through 28 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Figs. 15A through 15C of the subject application in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,559 (Yoshino, et al.) in further view of U.S. Patent Nos. 4,998,124 (Ishida, et al.), 5,404,152 (Nagai), 4,994,843 (Kitazawa), 4,520,240 (Swindler), 5,392,088 (Abe, et al.), and 5,895,130 (Saito, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 27 recite, inter alia, (a) a focus controller that focuses on the determined main object area (determined out of the areas grouped) using information of the focus map, in combination with (b) maintaining a focus condition until it has been determined that the operation member has been operated to set as a new main object area one of the object areas and then causes the focus controller to focus on the new main object area using information of the focus map.

Claims 16 and 28 recite, inter alia, (a) focusing on the main object area (determined out of the areas grouped) using information of the focus map, in combination with (b) maintaining a focus condition on the determined main object area until it has been determined that the operation has been operated, with changing to focus on the new main object area using information of the focus map when the main object area is changed.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Figs. 15A through 15C, Yoshino, et al., Ishida, et al., Nagai, Kitazawa, Swindler, Abe, et al., and Saito, et al., even in the proposed combinations, assuming, arguendo, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed combinations of claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 1, 16, 27, and 28.

The Official Action acknowledges that Figs. 15A through 15C are silent as to changing the object area, and therefore relies upon Yoshino, et al. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshino, et al. shows, e.g., in Fig. 7, that focus detection is performed using one of a plurality of predetermined focusing areas (e.g., Fig. 6), and next it is determined whether or not the detection area for performing focus detection has been changed, and if so (step #360), then detection is performed once again using the selected area (step #380), which Applicants respectfully submit provides neither a description nor a suggestion of the above-discussed combinations of features including, inter alia, performing “focus on the new main object area using information of the focus map”.

The Official Action is understood to acknowledge that deficiency, when stating at page 3, at the end of the first full paragraph, that Figs. 15A through 15C with Yoshino, et al. fails to disclose focusing using the focus map, and therefore relies upon Ishida, et al. However, Applicants respectfully traverse such reliance and submit that Ishida, et al. does not disclose a focus map as claimed. Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants respectfully submit that Ishida, et al. shows, e.g., using a focus condition of an object, with a memory for storing defocus data obtained in a present detection cycle, a previous detection cycle, and a cycle before the previous detection cycle. Applicants respectfully submit that the data stored in such a memory in

Ishida, et al. cannot be used to “focus on the new main object area using information of the focus map” as claimed in combination.

Applicants respectfully note that Kitazawa shows, e.g., an object distance measuring area selecting switch 42; however, Applicants respectfully submit that such provides neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed combinations of claimed features.

The Official Action relies upon UP/DOWN dial 36 of Saito, et al. Applicants respectfully submit that said dial is for increasing or decreasing the value of object distance, and provides neither a description nor a suggestion of the above-discussed claimed features.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly

believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Daniel S. Glueck", is written over a horizontal line.

Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/lip

DC_MAIN 210128v1